

Stephen W. Townsend, Clerk
Supreme Court of New Jersey
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street
P.O. Box 970
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0970

RE: Abbott, et.al. v. Burke, et.al.
Docket No. 42,170

Dear Mr. Townsend:

The Association for Children of New Jersey (ACNJ) respectfully submits this letter brief in support of its Motion for Leave to Appear as *Amicus Curiae* in the above-captioned case.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>STATEMENT OF FACTS</u>	2
<u>ARGUMENT</u>	
I. <u>The State's Request to Hold Supplemental Funding In the Abbott Districts to 2005-2006 Levels Must Be Considered in the Context of the Extraordinary Needs of the Children</u>	7
II. <u>Significant Gains in Abbott Districts' Early Elementary Test Scores May Be Jeopardized If Supplemental Funding is Frozen</u>	13
III. <u>The State Has Always Had the Power and Authority to Provide Monitoring and Ensure Accountability in the Abbott Programs</u>	18
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	20

Association for
Children of
New Jersey
35 Halsey Street
Newark, NJ 07102
973.643.3876
Fax 973.643.9153
www.acnj.org
www.kidlaw.org
www.makekidscountnj.org

Building a Better Future for All New Jersey Children
Join us at www.MakeKidsCountNJ.org

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Association for Children of New Jersey (hereinafter know as "ACNJ"), is a statewide non-profit child advocacy organization, dedicated to advancing children's rights and to improving programs and policies for New Jersey's children and families. ACNJ advocates on behalf of children and families on the state and national level. ACNJ conducts its advocacy efforts through public policy analysis and monitoring, research, and community outreach and education on many issues related to children, including child welfare, juvenile justice, health, early care and education and supports for low-income families. Its Board of Trustees and professional staff represent a broad cross-section of individuals and organizations strongly committed to the rights and well-being of children.

ACNJ has participated as *amicus curiae* on four prior occasions when the Court considered issues in the Abbott v. Burke litigation. Our focus now, as then, is on the needs of children in these districts.

ACNJ has a particular interest and expertise to offer in the matter before the Court. As *amicus curiae* in the prior Abbott litigations ACNJ focused on children's needs by utilizing its independent research and analysis to inform the Court on the many disadvantages experienced by children in the Abbott

districts. Much of ACNJ's research and analysis is connected with our agency's role in *Kids Count*.

Kids Count is a nationwide, multi-state initiative funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation that uses data to improve the well-being of children. ACNJ is the *Kids Count* grantee in New Jersey and tracks a variety of indicators in 10 areas including poverty, health, child protection and education. ACNJ publishes annually several *Kids Count* data books, including *New Jersey Kids Count*, *New Jersey City Kids Count* and *Newark Kids Count*.

ACNJ has also worked on policy issues related to child poverty. In 2004, ACNJ released a policy brief entitled, *Getting Real About Poverty in New Jersey*, which compared the federal poverty level with the Self-Sufficiency Standard. In 2005, ACNJ updated its 1999 report, *Working-But Still Poor in New Jersey* to document that economic security is still out of reach for many working poor families. This report, *The Ends Don't Meet*, made recommendations for policy reform to assist low-income working families.

For over a decade, ACNJ has taken an active role in monitoring the State's efforts to implement early childhood programs. Prior to the Supreme Court's decision in Abbott V, ACNJ had undertaken a project to assess implementation of the Early Childhood Program Aid under the Comprehensive Education Improvement Funding Act and to inform the broader early

childhood education community on the opportunity for collaboration under that Act.

Since 1998, ACNJ has facilitated collaboration among the broader early childhood education community. Cecilia Zalkind, ACNJ's executive director, chairs the Early Care and Education Coalition, (hereinafter, "The Coalition") a group of over 40 individuals and organizations, representing every aspect of early childhood education, including education, Head Start, child care and higher education communities. Soon after the Abbott V decision, the Coalition developed a position statement that outlined the necessary elements of a comprehensive, high quality early learning system. Those elements were used by the Supreme Court as the framework for defining quality preschool in the Abbott VI decision.

The Coalition continues to meet several times each year to identify and address issues that have arisen around implementation and to act as an "information exchange" for its members.

As an organization, ACNJ remains active in monitoring and advocating for the Court's vision of quality preschool in the Abbott districts. Since the Abbott VI decision, ACNJ has been involved in several preschool issues linked to quality, including teacher and program quality, facilities, enrollment and school readiness.

In 2003 and 2004, ACNJ worked closely with the Rutgers Graduate School of Education (hereinafter "GSE") to address the education status of Abbott preschool teachers who were required by the Court to obtain their Bachelor's degrees and appropriate early childhood endorsements by September 2004. ACNJ played a pivotal role in securing an extension for many Abbott preschool teachers.

Using the GSE research, ACNJ has been advocating for reform in the articulation system between the State's community colleges and its four year institutions. Since June 2005, ACNJ has worked closely with the Joint Committee on the Public Schools, the Commission of Higher Education and the New Jersey Presidents' Council to bring about an integrated system.

ACNJ has been involved in advocating for educationally adequate preschool facilities in Abbott districts. ACNJ and the Education Law Center (ELC) have coauthored two reports: *The ABC's of Preschool Facilities in New Jersey: A Primer*, which provides an overview of the history of preschool facilities in New Jersey and identifies the continued barriers for all facilities in meeting educationally standards, and *Planning for Quality: Ensuring Educational Adequacy for All Abbott Preschool Facilities*, which analyzes DOE data from community providers and makes initial findings and recommendations for needed policy changes.

Recently, ACNJ completed a policy brief entitled, *The Link Between Classrooms and Enrollment: An Abbott Preschool Dilemma*, which analyzes the status of Abbott preschool facilities and its implications on full enrollment. ACNJ has used all of its research and the above-mentioned publications as advocacy tools to educate the public and persuade state leaders on the important role that educationally adequate facilities play in the quality of preschool programs.

Since 2003, ACNJ's preschool agenda has moved beyond education in order to develop stronger early learning systems in our State. ACNJ has led New Jersey's Build Initiative, a multi-state partnership created to help states develop a coordinated system of programs, policies and services that is responsive to the needs of families and is effective in preparing our youngest children for a successful future. ACNJ recently published, *Build the Future: A Blueprint for Early Learning in New Jersey*, which outlines the plan for a coordinated system, which includes providing access to early childhood programs, ensuring quality, supporting parents, training and supporting professionals, coordinating systems and educating the public.

ARGUMENT

POINT I

The State's Request to Hold Supplemental Funding In the Abbott Districts to 2005-2006 Levels Must Be Considered in the Context of the Extraordinary Needs of the Children

The New Jersey Supreme Court has long acknowledged the impact of disadvantage on the ability of children in the Abbott districts to succeed in school. Sixteen years ago, this Court described the extra-educational needs of children in the Abbott districts as creating a difference that is monumental, no matter how it is measured. Abbott v. Burke, 119 N.J. 287, 369 (1990) (Abbott II). The Court further acknowledged that these needs were not solely educational, but also stemmed from family and community impoverishment. "They include food, clothing and shelter, and extend to lack of close family and community ties and support and lack of helpful role models. They include the needs that arise from a life led in an environment of violence, poverty and despair." Ibid.

The Court linked these extraordinary needs directly to school success, describing them as "needs that palpably undercut their capacity to learn." Ibid. The Court did not ask school districts to assume the role of parents or the community, but to address those needs that impact directly on a child's ability to learn. "The goal is to motivate them, to wipe out their disadvantages as much as a school district can, and to give them an educational opportunity that will enable them to use their innate ability." Ibid.

It was recognition of these extraordinary needs that led the Court to order funding not only to enable the Abbott districts to attain parity with wealthier districts, but to access additional funding to address the disadvantages faced by these children in their homes and communities. That is how supplemental funding was created:

The supplemental programs are a crucial part of the herculean reform that must be undertaken to enhance plaintiffs' educational opportunity. Without such programs, it is doubtful that the children of our inner cities ever will have the opportunity to emerge with an education that will enable them to compete and participate in society. The fact that the educational dividends derived from those programs may not be immediately apparent or easily measurable does not render them in any sense ancillary to the achievement of a thorough and efficient education. Rather, supplemental programs for disadvantaged students are the indispensable foundation of a thorough and efficient education and a fundamental prerequisite to the fulfillment of the State's constitutional obligation. Abbott v. Burke, 149 N.J. 145, 199 (1997) (Abbott V).

As the Court considers the State's request to hold supplemental funds to 2005-2006 levels, it must continue to be mindful, as it has in the past, of the broader needs of children in the Abbott districts. Children in these communities continue to live in poverty. The disadvantage they face - inadequate health care, poor living conditions, increased vulnerability - has continued and, in some instances, worsened. These children remain the most impoverished and disadvantaged in the state.

For the last fourteen years, ACNJ has published annual data reports on the well-being of children in New Jersey. These reports, which measure progress on key indicators of child well-being including poverty, health, education and child welfare, are based on data obtained from State departments and divisions. The

State Kids Count Report provides data on the state and county level. The *Newark Kids Count Report* focuses specifically on Newark and includes more in-depth data.

In 2004, ACNJ published the *New Jersey City Kids Count Report*, which measured child well-being in 25 cities in New Jersey. These cities were selected based on population and need and include 17 Abbott districts.¹ ACNJ plans to publish an updated city report this year and is in the process of gathering and analyzing more recent data for inclusion in this book. The data collection and analysis is complete on several indicators. ACNJ has prepared tables providing updated data for the 17 Abbott districts attached to this letter brief as the Appendix. This data provides a compelling picture of the challenges facing children in the Abbott districts and exemplifies the disadvantage that impedes their school success.

The most significant and discouraging finding from this data is the persistent and extreme poverty in which children in the Abbott districts live. The most recent year for which census data is available on poverty in these cities is 1999. According to the census data, 28 percent of children in these 17 Abbott districts were growing up in poor families, as compared to 11 percent of children statewide. See Appendix, Table 1. Over one-half of poor children in New Jersey live in these 17 districts. Ibid. District-specific data is even more disheartening. Camden has a

¹ The 17 Abbott districts included in the *2004 New Jersey City Kids Count Report* were Asbury Park, Bridgeton, Camden, East Orange, Elizabeth, Irvington, Jersey City, Newark, New Brunswick, Orange, Passaic, Paterson, Perth Amboy, Plainfield, Trenton, Union City and Vineland.

child poverty rate of 45 percent, Asbury Park, 39 percent and Bridgeton, 33 percent. Ibid.

It is important to understand that poverty is based on the Federal Poverty Level (FPL), a standard applied to all states regardless of their cost of living. In 2002, the FPL was \$18,100 for a family comprised of two adults, an infant and a preschool-age child. Association for Children of New Jersey, *Getting Real About Poverty in New Jersey* (2004).

<http://www.acnj.org/admin.asp?uri=2081&action=15&di=353&ext=pdf&view=yes>

At the same time, the Self-Sufficiency Standard, which measures how much income is needed for a family to adequately meet its basic needs, found that same family of four in New Jersey would need \$49,811 simply to make ends meet. Id. at 3.

Comparing data over time demonstrates that these economic conditions have not changed significantly. The poverty level in most of these districts remained virtually the same from 1989 to 1999. Asbury Park, Bridgeton and Camden saw slight decreases in child poverty. However, Irvington's child poverty rate went from 18 percent to 23 percent and Plainfield's rate grew from 16 percent to 21 percent. See Appendix, Table 1.

Data on employment and income in these districts suggest that significant improvement is not likely. Unemployment rates were consistently nearly twice the state average over the past five years. In 2004, the average unemployment rate in these 17 cities was nearly 9 percent, compared to about 5 percent statewide. The rates ranged from a high of 15 percent in Camden to a low of 6.4 percent in Vineland. See Appendix, Table 2.

The 17 Abbott districts accounted for half of the single-parent households in New Jersey in 2000 compared to a statewide average of 22 percent. See Appendix, Table 3. They also accounted for almost one-half of births to teens. See Appendix, Table 9. Single parents are much more likely to struggle to pay the rent and put food on the table than their married counterparts.

At \$32,079, the median family income in these districts was less than half of the statewide average of \$65,282. See Appendix, Table 4. Children in these districts are more likely to be living in families receiving public assistance. While the number of children receiving welfare has dropped since 1999, following welfare reform, the Abbott children continue to make up a disproportionate percent of the total children receiving this assistance. In 2005, children in these 17 districts accounted for 60 percent of all New Jersey children receiving welfare. This represents 43,000 children out of a statewide total of 71,539. See Appendix, Table 5.

Over 112,000 children in the 17 Abbott districts received Food Stamps, 61 percent of all children who received Food Stamps. See Appendix, Table 6. Seventy-three percent of school children in these 17 districts received free or reduced-price lunch, compared to a statewide average of 27 percent. District-specific data is even more dramatic. Over 90 percent of children in Union City receive free or reduced lunch. See Appendix, Table 7. Almost half of all recipients receiving assistance from the Women, Infant and Children Food Program (WIC) lived in these 17 districts. See Appendix, Table 8.

The *Newark Kids Count Report 2005* provides a more in-depth and sobering picture of the extreme impoverishment that continues for children growing up in Newark. Association for Children of New Jersey, *Newark Kids Count 2005* (2005), <http://www.acnj.org/admin.asp?uri=2081&action=15&di=644&ext=pdf&view=yes>. Nearly half of Newark residents are poor or working poor. Although the number of Newark children growing up in poverty dropped 10 percent from 2000 to 2004, one-third of all children in Newark are still growing up in families earning incomes below the federal poverty level Id. at 7.

Data on household income, rent and the cost of living in Newark provides a stark picture of how families struggle to make ends meet. In Newark, median household income dropped 4 percent from 2000 to 2004, averaging \$26,309. Id. at 8. At the same time, the median gross rent increased from \$609 to \$648 per month in Newark. Ibid. More than one-half of families in Newark spend more than 30 percent of their income on rent and over 25 percent spend more than 50 percent of their income on rent, a 75 percent increase from 2000 to 2004. Ibid. According to the Self-Sufficiency Standard for Essex County, it would cost a family of four, including two adults, an infant and a preschool-age child, over \$47,000 just to meet basic needs. Id. at 9.

Health data for children in Newark is discouraging and highlights the importance of strong early care and education. In 2003, 44 percent of births in Newark were to women who received late or no prenatal care. Id. at 11. Over 10 percent were low birth weight babies. Id. at 12. Less than 70 percent of children

in Newark were immunized by age 2, compared to a state average of almost 85 percent. Id. at 13. Over 35 percent of children who are lead poisoned lived in Newark in 2003. Ibid.

Children in Newark are overrepresented in the state's child welfare system. Ten percent of children under supervision of the State Division of Youth and Family Services due to abuse or neglect live in Newark, a 45 percent increase from 2001 to 2005. Id. at 14. In 2005, 18 percent of all children in out-of-home placement were from Newark. Ibid.

This data paints a bleak portrait of life for children in the Abbott districts. It also makes a strong argument about the continued importance of the supplemental funding. ACNJ urges the Court to remain mindful of the disadvantage faced by these children as it considers the state's request to hold supplemental funding level in the Abbott districts.

Point II

Significant Gains in Abbott Districts' Early Elementary Test Scores May be Jeopardized if Supplemental Funding is Frozen.

Recent increases in third and fourth grade test scores of Abbott children can be linked to a number of early education initiatives, including preschool, full day kindergarten and early reading literacy programs. While the Governor's proposed FY 07 budget recommends an increase in Abbott preschool programs, funding for full-day kindergarten and early reading literacy programs may be in jeopardy if the Court grants the State's motion for flat state funding of supplemental programs.

NJ Department of Education data indicates that from 2003-2004 to 2004-2005, the percentage of Abbott 3rd graders passing the State test rose from 62 percent to 69 percent in Language Arts and from 58 percent to 70 percent in Mathematics. Moreover, the overall Language Arts percentages in five Abbott districts and the overall Math percentages in four Abbott districts were higher than the State average. Source: New Jersey Department of Education, School Report Cards, 2005.

Similarly, the state assessment in Grade 4 indicates a narrowing of the achievement gap between Abbott and non-Abbott districts. From 2000-2001 to 2004-2005 school years, the percentage of Abbott general education students scoring at least proficient in Language Arts increased from 63 percent to 77 percent. Comparable changes were insignificant in non-Abbott districts as a whole. Similarly, Abbott Math scores significantly improved. In 1998-1999, only 36 percent of Abbott elementary students were at least proficient, compared to 72 percent in 2004-2005. Abbott gains were significantly higher than changes in non-Abbott districts. Education Law Center, *Abbott Districts in 2005-06: Progress and Challenge*, Abbott Indicators Project (2006).

When the Court required quality preschool programs for three- and four-year olds in all Abbott districts, it clearly acknowledged that preschool would result in "significant and

substantial positive impact on academic achievement in both early and later school years." Abbott V at 506. In its seventh year of implementation, the impact Abbott preschool is having on young children is clear. This year, nearly 40,000 three- and four-year olds, are attending Abbott preschool programs in the 31 school districts. Source: NJ Department of Education, 2005. Moreover, classroom assessment data indicates that those preschoolers are receiving a level of quality education in developmentally appropriate environments that did not exist seven years ago. Early Learning Improvement Consortium, *Giant Steps for the Littlest Children: Progress in the Sixth Year of the Abbott Preschool Program* (2005). The improvement of classroom quality is directly linked to the requirements outlined in the Abbott VI decision, including qualified preschool teachers, a maximum class size of 15 children and curriculum standards. Abbott VI.

The State clearly recognizes the significant gains made because of the Abbott preschool programs, as Governor Corzine has recommended in his FY 07 proposed state budget an additional \$39 million in preschool expansion aid to support approved preschool programs and budgets for 2006-2007.

However, quality preschool is the first step in a strong early education process. Equally important is full day kindergarten for all five-year olds. "Finally, research clearly

supports the notion that full-day kindergarten is an essential part of a thorough and efficient education for the Abbott children." Abbott V at 503. In the Abbott V opinion, Justice Handler quotes from the Commissioner of Education's report, "studies have shown that well-planned, developmentally appropriate full-day kindergarten programs for five-year olds clearly provide one of the most cost-effective strategies for lowering the dropout rate and helping children at-risk become more effective learners in elementary school, particularly in first grade. Ibid, at 502. Full-day kindergarten is considered a required supplemental program, and is included as part of a list of such programs in an appendix to Abbott X, entitled, "Supplemental Programs in Abbott Schools." Abbott v. Burke, 177 N.J. 596 (2003) (Abbott X).

The Early Reading Literacy Programs are another critical initiative to continue the gains Abbott children have made by participating in quality preschool and full-day kindergarten. The objectives of this required supplemental program is to assure that early elementary children are reading at an appropriate level, to prevent children from falling behind and requiring remediation and to intervene early when a student is experiencing difficulty. These objectives are met through specific educational steps, including daily 90 minute reading

blocks, regular student assessments, and one on one tutoring.

Ibid.

Research indicates that preschool investments alone are not adequate and that quality full-day kindergarten and strong early literacy are also needed.

In order to maximize successful outcomes for children, preschool investments must be complemented by investments during the elementary school years. In order to sustain public investment in education, children who have attended quality preschool programs must transition into well-aligned, quality early elementary programs. Bogard, Takanishi, *PK-3: An Aligned and Coordinated Approach to Education for Children 3 to 8 Years Old*, Society for Research in Child Development (2005). For some children, cognitive gains made in preschool are not sustained throughout elementary school. McKey, Condelli, Granson, Barrett, McConkey & Plantz, *The Impact of Head Start on Children, Families and Communities* (1985).

From recent early elementary test scores it is clear that the Abbott districts' multi-year combination of quality programs, including preschool, full-day kindergarten and early reading literacy has begun to lay a foundation for long-term educational success for those children attending these programs. The scores indicate that the skills learned in the early

elementary programs are built on children's skills from preschool.

While the Governor's proposed budget will provide Abbott preschool programs with an increase in state dollars, neither the State's brief nor the Certification of Lucille E. Davy, provide any evidence of how flat funding will impact existing supplemental programs, including full-day kindergarten and early literacy. See Certification of Lucille E. Davy. Recent gains in early elementary test scores may be lost if cuts to these two successful supplementary programs take place.

POINT III

The State Has Always Had the Power and Authority to Provide Monitoring and Ensure Accountability in the Abbott Programs

In its brief, the State asks the Court for permission to freeze Abbott supplemental funding in FY 2007 in order for the new Governor to bring "fiscal integrity to the State budget and to provide the State with the time necessary to ensure the level of fiscal and programmatic accountability in Abbott school districts that both this Court and the public demands." See State's Brief, p. 4.

ACNJ agrees with the State that it has a responsibility to "subject school districts to the same level of management oversight and fiscal discipline as the Governor has applied to the Executive Department" See State's Brief, p. 31. However, the freezing of state funds is not required for the State to carry out that responsibility.

The State has always had the authority and responsibility to hold districts accountable for how they spend their dollars. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to promulgate regulations for Abbott districts. In fact, last year's emergency regulations on Supplemental Programs and Services outlined a specific process for districts to identify a particularized need essential for "success by a specific population of students in achieving the Core Curriculum Content Standards" beyond regular Abbott funding. It included a format to apply to the Department of Education for supplemental funding. N.J.A.C. 6A:24.5.

The Court has been consistently clear that "the State must take affirmative and aggressive action to ensure that all regular education funding, including the additional remedial money, is spent effectively and efficiently in the Abbott districts." Abbott V, at 194-95. It is disingenuous to now argue that Abbott funds need to be frozen so that the State can provide the management oversight it always had the authority to implement, particularly without any data to support the impact that flat funding will have on programs and children.

It is the State that bears the burden of documenting why the supplemental funding is not needed, which it fails to do in its brief. While ACNJ supports any steps taken by the State to improve accountability measures in the districts, it should not be at the expense of programs affecting children.


Conclusion

It is tragic that the extraordinary needs of the Abbott children have not been met nor greater gains achieved in their academic performance. ACNJ urges the Court to continue to put the needs of these children first in considering the State's motion. The decision to freeze supplemental funding cannot be based solely on the State's fiscal crisis or because the State has not done its job in overseeing the funding.

The strongest positive demonstrable gains for children come from preschool. This is the program in which this Court was the most prescriptive, mandating the details of class size, teacher credentials, curriculum and supplemental services. Abbott VI. It was the championship of this Court that led to these positive results.

ACNJ urges the Court to continue to be the champion for children in the Abbott districts and to put their needs first in making its decision.

Respectfully submitted,



Cecilia Zalkind, Esq.
Association for Children of New Jersey

Cynthia Rice, Esq.
On the Brief

Dated: April 21, 2006

APPENDIX

ACNJ Letter Brief as Amicus Curiae

Table 1
CHILDREN LIVING BELOW THE FEDERAL POVERTY LEVEL
ABBOTT DISTRICTS

CITY	1989		1999	
	#	%	#	%
Asbury Park	1,882	43	1,982	39
Bridgeton	2,240	41	1,964	33
Camden	15,278	49	12,333	45
East Orange	4,931	26	4,789	24
Elizabeth	6,860	25	7,002	22
Irvington	2,887	18	3,885	23
Jersey City	16,454	29	16,015	27
Newark	28,631	36	27,285	36
New Brunswick	1,775	25	2,618	27
Orange	1,924	27	2,173	24
Passaic	3,869	24	5,803	28
Paterson	10,922	27	12,743	29
Perth Amboy	2,570	23	3,255	24
Plainfield	2,001	16	2,786	21
Trenton	6,285	27	6,255	26
Union City	3,842	27	4,783	28
Vineland	2,270	16	2,564	18
Abbott Totals/Avg	114,621	28	118,235	28
NJ	200,726	11	227,754	11
City % of NJ	57	N/A	52	N/A

Source: US Bureau of the Census, American Fact Finder, Decennial Census 1990 and 2000
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=DEC&_submenuId=datasets_1&_lang=en

1989 data is from 1990 Summary Tape File 3, chart P117. Poverty Status in 1989 by Age
 1999 data is from 2000 Summary Tape File 3, chart P87. Poverty Status in 1999 by Age

Table 2
UNEMPLOYMENT
ABBOTT DISTRICTS

CITY	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Asbury Park	7.5	8.8	12.0	12.3	10.1
Bridgeton	7.8	8.8	10.2	10.6	8.9
Camden	11.3	11.6	16.5	16.9	15.1
East Orange	6.1	7.3	9.8	9.8	8.0
Elizabeth	6.4	7.6	10.4	10.3	8.3
Irvington	5.1	6.1	8.2	8.3	6.7
Jersey City	6.0	6.9	9.5	9.2	7.5
Newark	7.7	9.2	12.3	12.4	10.1
New Brunswick	5.9	7.1	9.8	9.7	7.9
Orange	5.0	6.0	8.1	8.1	6.5
Passaic	7.1	8.4	10.9	11.3	9.4
Paterson	7.2	8.5	11.0	11.4	9.5
Perth Amboy	7.4	8.8	12.0	11.9	9.8
Plainfield	5.6	6.6	9.1	9.0	7.2
Trenton	7.0	8.0	11.1	10.8	8.9
Union City	6.0	7.0	9.6	9.2	7.6
Vineland	5.6	6.4	7.4	7.7	6.4
Abbott Average	6.7	7.8	10.5	10.5	8.7
New Jersey	3.7	4.3	5.8	5.9	4.8

Source: New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Annual Data: Total Labor Force, Employed, Unemployed and Unemployment Rate, Municipality Estimates
<http://www.wnjin.net/OneStopCareerCenter/LaborMarketInformation/lmi11/index.html>

Table 3
SINGLE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS
ABBOTT DISTRICTS

CITY	1990		2000	
	#	%	#	%
Asbury Park	2,263	62.7	2,739	68
Bridgeton	2,360	52.2	2,437	53
Camden	16,624	66.7	14,312	67
East Orange	7,961	55.2	8,923	60
Elizabeth	8,112	34.4	9,944	37
Irvington	5,902	44.4	7,199	54
Jersey City	20,409	42.7	21,168	43
Newark	34,795	56.2	33,901	57
New Brunswick	2,709	47.1	3,176	43
Orange	2,732	46.1	3,681	51
Passaic	4,870	35.9	6,128	36
Paterson	14,079	42.2	16,217	46
Perth Amboy	3,329	34.3	4,496	40
Plainfield	3,846	39.8	4,481	45
Trenton	9,254	50	10,603	57
Union City	4,712	37.5	5,450	37
Vineland	3,621	29.7	4,416	36
Abbott Total/Avg	147,578	46	159,271	49
NJ	334,711	20.6	420,931	22
Abbott % of NJ	50	n/a	38	n/a

Source: US Bureau of the Census, American Fact Finder, Decennial Census 1990 and 2000
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=DEC&_submenuId=datasets_1&_lang=en

1990 data is from 1990 Summary Tape File 1, chart P021. Household Type and Relationship

2000 data is from 2000 Summary Tape File 2, chart PCT9. Household Size, Household Type, and Presence of Own Children

Table 4
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN
ABBOTT DISTRICTS

CITY	1999
Asbury Park	22,762
Bridgeton	26,929
Camden	20,695
East Orange	30,943
Elizabeth	34,970
Irvington	35,159
Jersey City	35,217
Newark	26,076
New Brunswick	31,391
Orange	35,260
Passaic	31,371
Paterson	30,713
Perth Amboy	36,256
Plainfield	44,258
Trenton	30,918
Union City	28,979
Vineland	43,439
Abbott Average	32,079
City Average	37,515
NJ	65,282

Source: US Bureau of the Census, American Fact Finder, Decennial Census 2000, Summary File 3, chart PCT39.
 MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME IN 1999 (DOLLARS) BY PRESENCE OF OWN CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=DEC&_submenuId=datasets_1&_lang=en

Table 5
CHILDREN RECEIVING AFDC/TANF
ABBOTT DISTRICTS

CITY	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Asbury Park	1,125	1,005	899	907	937	857	815
Bridgeton	889	671	675	581	614	657	697
Camden	7,806	6,261	5,309	4,899	5,156	5,010	4,641
East Orange	3,909	3,610	2,905	2,417	2,369	2,667	2,549
Elizabeth	3,082	2,452	2,215	2,017	1,961	2,176	2,108
Irvington	2,877	2,532	2,112	1,783	1,861	1,973	1,908
Jersey City	10,276	8,034	6,746	5,783	5,821	5,819	5,814
Newark	21,392	18,967	15,329	12,383	11,806	11,930	10,708
New Brunswick	873	638	549	545	636	707	756
Orange	1,306	1,060	855	661	629	623	644
Passaic	1,739	1,400	1,099	1,037	1,055	1,056	1,112
Paterson	5,532	4,586	3,994	3,993	3,741	4,081	4,121
Perth Amboy	924	639	606	600	597	616	532
Plainfield	1,607	1,213	1,109	990	963	1,009	919
Trenton	3,895	2,959	2,897	3,206	3,344	3,531	3,494
Union City	2,108	1,656	1,334	1,105	958	1,002	1,057
Vineland	920	734	717	779	777	756	823
Willingboro	465	326	344	325	366	411	365
Abbott Totals	70,725	58,743	49,694	44,011	43,591	44,881	43,063
NJ	101,168	81,958	71,212	64,746	65,601	68,312	71,539
Abbott Share of Children on Welfare	70%	72%	70%	68%	66%	66%	60%

Source: Department of Human Services, Division of Family Development sends ACNJ these data each year by request

Table 6
CHILDREN RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS
ABBOTT DISTRICTS

CITY	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Asbury Park	2,050	1,984	1,973	2,088	2,162	2,167	2,001
Bridgeton	1,979	1,847	1,774	1,907	2,074	2,110	2,458
Camden	13,065	11,826	10,519	10,310	10,983	11,727	12,081
East Orange	6,007	5,543	4,872	4,757	4,971	5,439	5,497
Elizabeth	5,141	4,725	4,241	4,554	4,744	5,098	5,283
Irvington	4,315	3,737	3,481	3,472	3,898	4,114	4,296
Jersey City	16,276	14,250	12,544	12,402	12,950	13,483	13,950
Newark	32,446	28,032	24,508	23,566	23,679	24,876	24,147
New Brunswick	1,527	1,232	1,134	1,193	1,373	1,570	1,736
Orange	2,093	1,717	1,512	1,413	1,341	1,398	1,537
Passaic	4,039	3,936	3,747	3,990	4,468	5,092	5,908
Paterson	11,945	11,209	10,983	11,353	12,087	14,058	15,515
Perth Amboy	1,767	1,576	1,444	1,419	1,685	2,003	2,040
Plainfield	2,301	2,018	1,867	1,968	2,040	2,344	2,163
Trenton	6,114	5,541	5,486	5,989	6,484	6,635	7,260
Union City	3,640	3,197	2,884	2,926	3,056	3,474	3,741
Vineland	2,017	1,883	2,007	2,078	2,312	2,464	2,689
Abbott Totals	116,722	104,253	94,976	95,385	100,307	108,052	112,302
New Jersey	175,767	157,635	146,299	149,725	160,810	174,841	184,327
Abbott Share of Children on Food Stamps							61%

Source: Department of Human Services, Division of Family Development sends ACNJ these data each year by request

Table 7
PERCENT CHILDREN RECEIVING FREE/REDUCED PRICE LUNCH
ABBOTT DISTRICTS

CITY	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Asbury Park	84	87	76	83	49
Bridgeton	37	81	80	78	82
Camden	81	78	80	79	77
East Orange	72	72	68	69	78
Elizabeth	74	83	72	73	76
Irvington	71	69	70	13	66
Jersey City	72	74	72	71	71
Newark	82	81	76	70	71
New Brunswick	77	77	80	77	80
Orange	80	80	79	82	81
Passaic	85	81	75	74	83
Paterson	75	81	80	63	71
Perth Amboy	79	80	80	81	79
Plainfield	66	64	70	69	70
Trenton	73	69	55	61	59
Union City	85	75	87	92	91
Vineland	56	57	56	57	59
Abbott Average	74	76	74	70	73
New Jersey Avg.	28	28	27	27	27

Source: New Jersey Department of Education Enrollment figures for each year
<http://www.state.nj.us/njded/data/enr/enr05/district.htm>
 Using the website query function, choose a county, then a district

**Table 8
WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN RECEIVING WIC BENEFITS
ABBOTT DISTRICTS**

CITY	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Asbury Park	949	972	1,090	1,149	1,228	1,209	1,209
Bridgeton	1,699	1,637	1,859	1,902	2,112	2,491	2,695
Camden	8,012	6,114	5,758	5,816	5,747	5,979	5,731
East Orange	4,388	3,154	2,965	3,078	3,293	3,226	3,226
Elizabeth	6,298	5,015	5,521	5,361	5,648	5,879	6,079
Irvington	2,930	2,545	2,784	2,766	2,751	2,940	2,878
Jersey City	11,363	10,169	10,495	10,425	10,141	10,355	10,184
Newark	14,110	12,483	12,354	12,127	12,540	13,158	13,291
New Brunswick	2,365	2,338	2,690	2,850	3,065	3,342	3,709
Orange	1,702	1,514	1,709	1,773	1,787	1,818	1,807
Passaic	3,860	3,921	4,167	4,222	4,340	4,526	4,716
Paterson	10,086	9,881	9,558	9,711	9,507	10,060	9,999
Perth Amboy	2,380	2,100	2,742	2,799	2,746	3,017	2,998
Plainfield	2,849	2,597	2,680	2,703	2,772	3,038	3,016
Trenton	5,114	5,247	5,967	5,615	5,819	6,170	5,950
Union City	3,740	3,659	3,896	3,924	3,860	4,158	4,176
Vineland	1,687	1,683	1,684	1,778	1,828	2,156	2,300
Abbott Totals	83,532	75,029	77,919	77,999	79,184	83,522	83,964
New Jersey	149,468	140,150	148,046	149,914	152,941	161,981	164,085
Abbott Share of WIC	56	54	53	52	52	52	51

Source: New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services sends ACNJ these data each year by request

Table 9
TEEN BIRTHS
ABBOTT DISTRICTS

CITY	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Asbury Park	83	60	67	49	64
Bridgeton	114	112	117	110	113
Camden	474	457	431	374	382
East Orange	181	177	153	148	163
Elizabeth	261	283	241	232	209
Irvington	137	127	124	133	105
Jersey City	472	452	369	347	338
Newark	826	803	778	648	675
New Brunswick	162	173	159	163	151
Orange	65	71	60	64	47
Passaic	219	223	240	209	173
Paterson	521	479	414	399	401
Perth Amboy	126	139	127	127	108
Plainfield	106	112	122	118	116
Trenton	281	274	300	252	233
Union City	128	127	103	118	108
Vineland	132	120	123	124	130
Abbott Totals	4,841	4,653	4,418	4,119	3,516
NJ	8,225	8,027	7,652	7,328	7,119
Abbott Share of Teen Births	59	58	58	56	50

Source: New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services, Center for Health Statistics sends ACNJ these data each year by request